FREEDOM

VOL. I No. 1 JANUARY 1, 1933 FIVE CENTS

To Our Readers

IN launching this publication it is our wish to avoid the trite and obvious as much as possible. The one reason why tradition and custom are followed in making a statement of our aims and objects lies in the hope that we shall have readers who did not see our predecessor *Road to Freedom.*

We do not pretend that the masses are calling us or that we would know exactly what they want if they did. We think we know what is good for them, but beyond that we decline to go. There are a number of liberty-loving individuals who want an organ that will represent their viewpoint and make articulate their desire for a society based upon freedom and good will instead of one based on classes and authority; and we will do our best to produce such an organ.

It will be impossible to avoid repeating old truths, but we shall try to repeat only those that are still new doctrine to most people. Above all, we shall try to make others want what we want, and we hope to do this by presenting our point of view intelligently and pointing out ways and means of applying our principles.

It is a truism that all over the world intelligent men and women are in agreement that chaos exists perhaps greater than ever before, a chaos due in large measure to the fact that the engine of exploitation used by the ruling class has got beyond their control. Anxious to become richer by more intensive methods of exploitation, this class has overreached itself by creating more goods than the producers can buy back with the wages and incomes they receive and we have the anomalous situation of a vast number of people hungry and cold because there are too many things. This situation, extraordinary enough in itself, is further complicated by the remedies proposed. If the honest radicals and reformers were only a little more introspective they would see that in their efforts to express themselves they are advocating and using methods that defeat self-expression in others. This results in constant conflict.

For years much good work was done by honest men and women in preaching temperance and pointing out the evils of the overindulgence in alcohol. When prohibition was attempted, educational work ceased and evils greater than alcohol took its place. It is the same with the attempts of social reformers and revolutionists. In so far as they spread the principles of the socialization of wealth we not only have no quarrel with them but applaud their good work. But when they attempt to inflict their theories on others through authority backed by force and violence we cease to be friends and become enemies.

In this blind and chaotic struggle we take our place, fully aware that the opportunity for spreading truth and falsehood, for education and miseducation, are greater than ever before; and with capitalism approaching its Waterloo the fight grows more bitter and more intense. By means of the radio the ruling class is able to address millions of people. By means of the radio the ruling class can and does spread lies and distort truths in such a manner as to make them worse than lies; because they make them seem plausible. To correct those distortions and refute the lies is a herculean task. While a great many men still laugh at education the number has greatly decreased, for it is being more and more recognized that one of the first acts of a ruling class is to try and cement its power by controlling schools and institutions of learning. It is the same in Imperial Japan, "communist" Russia, fascist Italy, or capitalist America. It has always been so, and however slow and hopeless the method of education seems at times it is in the end the only effective way. The so-called logic of events may cause millions of people to vote against Hoover, but the uncertainty and confusion caused by the spread of false information and false values has caused nearly twenty-two million more to vote for Roosevelt.

The world is undergoing changes so vast and rapid that, as H. G. Wells says, it is veritably a race between education and catastrophe. Every form of government, from Russian "communism" to fascism, and embracing several kinds of republicanism, democracy, and monarchy, is being tried throughout the world at this moment and all to one purpose: to maintain things much as they are while pretending they are different. If this were not so the problem of distributing the wealth of the world would have kept pace with production and there would not be a hungry person in the world today.

The anarchist has a very definite contribution to make to this problem; while asserting old truths, he can and should give them an interpretation corresponding to the problems of the day. In practically every field of human activity the anarchist spirit leads the world. In science, education, art, literature, poetry, the drama, and even in the production of commodities the individual challenges accepted dogmas and blazes new trials revolutionizing man's outlook on the world. Only in the field of wealth-distribution, the greatest problem of our time, a field which requires the coöperation of vast numbers of individuals, does the anarchist lag behind. Must we admit that it is a problem beyond us and that of all people the anarchist, the most truly social being on earth, is unable to coöperate with his fellows?

To publish even a small paper like this requires coöperation. It requires hope and a willingness to make at least some small sacrifice for one's opinions. It is launched with the expectation that if its readers like it and feel it worth while they will help not only to keep it alive but to make it known and extend its influence in these crucial times.

Let us remember the words of that great thinker Kropotkin, "It is hope and not despair that makes revolutionists."

Towards Freedom

By L. RAYMOND

REVOLUTIONARY people all over the world are marching towards a free society, towards freedom. This is their final aim, now, after many struggles and disillusions. They are more sure of themselves and know that there is no salvation for the working class as long as they place their hopes in messiahs, be they red or white or yellow. The power of the workers rests within themselves and the sooner they find a way to work together in free associations, groups, free communities, the better it will be for their final emancipation from all tyranny.

A free society is not possible as long as the workers listen to politicians or bolsheviks disguised as emancipators. These new tyrants will not do anything to better the workers' situation. *No government is good. Governments do not want free men; they want slaves.* People need no governments, tyrants, gods, churches, or messiahs. What they need is freedom—and plenty of it, to develop morally and socially and conduct themselves intelligently to create a free form of society — free communes, groups, federations of groups—and to act and live as freely as they see fit, without the interference of demagogues, leaders or prophets.

Leaders and politicians will never get off the backs of the workers. They are useless and belong to the past. They form a class by themselves and work for their own exclusive betterment. When they are forced to leave a radical organization, they always form another under one name or another, in order to live as comfortably as the very capitalists they pretend to want to do away with. These yellow leaders, often, go over to the enemy's camps and become their staunchest defenders. When they form new organizations, they create nothing but confusion. Sometimes they do it under the name of "dictatorship of the proletariat." In other words this is nothing but a new form of tyranny, the worst of all, being more cruel and brutal.

The red "messiah" did and still does everything to crush every voice that dares to point the way to a freer form of society based on freedom and human understanding. The world knows about the Kronstadt Rebellion. Remember, the Kronstadt rebels were the soul of the Russian Revolution, but revolutionary Trotsky did not hesitate to crush the revolt in a sadistic manner that made the world tremble with disgust.

When MacDonald, an ex-miner and labor-organizer, got into power, he forgot all about his human ideals, his principles and his brothers. He became, instead, a relentless defender of the British Empire and is now a close friend of the King George V. When his brothers went out on strike, MacDonald like Mussolini, Trotsky and Co., crushed the strike with all the force at his disposal. What matter if the workers die of starvation? Let the dogs starve. They are only good for cannon fodder. The Empire must be saved at all cost. And there you have another leader betraying and crushing with the brutality of Nero the very brothers that at one time he loved and for whose emancipation he supposedly worked.

Turn your eyes now to Germany, once ruled by eight million Socialists who voted all the war credits, shot down the Spartacan revolutionists and all those who opposed their regime, exploited and enslaved the workers just as the Kaiser did. Today they are divided and subdivided into parties and fascist organizations, abused, hungry, homeless and with no way open for them but through a Social revolution that would put an end to all forms of tyranny, be they labor, Republican or Socialist governments.

To convince yourselves of the futility of governments, study the Socialist government of Spain. Since coming into power it has jailed more than 5000 Anarchist and Anarcho-Syndicalist revolutionists in Barcelona alone. It has deported hundreds to the Sahara desert; and shot down workers, as Anido the murderer and as the jackal Rivera did. But in spite of terroristic methods, the comrades were brought back from the Sahara desert through the revolutionary strikes and protests that the Spanish proletariat carried on, and are still continuing. The C. N. T. has now 1,300,000 members. The

Spanish proletariat has kept its activities toward libertarian anarchism alive since the First International. It has been influenced by such teachers of anarchism as Bakunin, Malatesta, Proudhon, Kropotkin, Grave, A. Lorenzo, and many others worthy of mention.

Since the 14th of April when this abortion of Republicanism and yellow Socialism came into being in Spain, the government has done everything to crush the Anarchist movement throughout the country. It fails. The socialists are discredited. The Republicans have no influence with the masses. The Bolsheviks lost their opportunity during the past five years, trying to capture the masses. They have three parties: yellow, conservative, and radical. After their utter failure, they are now trying to capture the "Workers' National Confederation" (C. N. T.). Let them try . . .

The C. N. T. is composed of Anarcho-Syndicalists, Anarchists and Libertarian Youth groups. The F. A. I.—Iberian Anarchist Federation, (including Portugal)—is the soul and orientator of the Workers' Conferderation. There are 500 Anarchist groups in Spain, nearly 200 of them being composed of Libertarian youth groups who work constantly for a social transformation. The revolution is already in gestation in Spain. Propaganda is concentrated on the idea of a social revolution, and the sooner it takes place the better.

At the birth of this republic the workers, as well as the intellectuals, with some exceptions, were all drunk with Republicanism. Their hopes were raised with promises of expropriation and redistribution of the land. Such promises remained promises only. This made the Anarchist movement much stronger than it was at the beginning. The movement is now flowing toward the revolution and immediate establishment of free comunities, *municipios libres*, free federalist associations and the development of the natural resources of the country. These are great enough to supply 80 million inhabitants, if everything were fully developed. The only possible invasion of Spain, would be through France. Personally, I don't believe France would dare make such a move. No matter what opinions one may have, the revolutionary movement in Spain will not be easily crushed. There are five million peasants without land and they are plethoric with Anarchistic principles and ideas. They demand immediate possession of the land, some of which they have already taken. "Land and liberty for All" is their cry.

The yellow syndicalists—the thirty signers of a conservative manifesto — are now saying that the Anarchists are causing trouble in the C. N. T. These syndicalists claimed, as the bourgeosie does, that "the workers are not ready for a revolution, we should wait till everyone is organized." I am quoting from memory, but this is the cause of the great dissension between Anarchists and these syndicalists. I happened to live in the same hotel where the conspirators carried on their propaganda against the monarchy. They came from all walks of life. Some of them have since become chiefs of police, senators, deputies and what not. The "Don Quixote" Macia, who once worked with the Anarchists in France acting comradely with them, is now following in the footsteps of Mussolini.

* * *

Peru has gone through a terroristic period and revolts have occurred sporadically, here and there. The Peruvian Incas were at one time highly civilized people. State Communism flourished in Peru for *four centuries*. They lived in free communities, and there was neither "yours nor mine." Nobody went hungry in Peru during this period of communism as they understood it. However, Pizarro and his brutal followers destroyed this State communism at its most flourishing time, the beginning of the fourteenth century. But the seeds of Anarchism are still there, and are now coming to life again.

* * *

Paraguay, in spite of its war fever, where Pietro Gori sang his revolutionary songs and carried on his Anarchist activities, is overflowing with Anarchist tendencies.

* * *

The Socialist fascists of Chile are also discredited. Once in power they suppressed all libertarian and labor papers, deported hundreds of comrades, shot men down like wild beasts. The prospects are good for Anarchist propaganda and the comrades there are now busy with Anarchist activities. The same is true of Brazil. A group of Anarchist comrades was brought to the capital to be deported. They sang revolutionary songs, the workers joining them. The police got busy with their clubs. . . .

* * *

In Montevideo, Uruguay, there was at one time a strong Anarchist movement. It has been dormant for a while, due to persecution and the confusion the Bolshevist party created there among the ranks of the working-class. Today there is activity again; one anarchist comrade with an auto truck loaded with anarchist literature, is going from town to town all over the Uruguayan country.

* * *

The situation in Argentina is more promising, and perhaps the revolution will take place there in a short time. In fact, it may be the first country to begin the Social revolution. There were many organizations previous to Uriburu's dictatorship, but since the Anarchists had a congress in Villadevato prison, one Anarchist organization, the F.O. R.A.—Regional Workers Federation of Argentina—was formed from over 72 diverse organizations. There is also the organization composed of socialists and workers' betrayers, but they have little influence. The daily Anarchist paper, organ of the F.O.R.A., "La Protesta" is carrying on an intensive campaign for the abolition of Tierra del Fuego's prison—an inferno comparable with Devils' Island, the French prison — immediate possession of the land, control of all comunications, immediate establishment of free communities; in short, they are daringly marching towards Anarchism, the ideal form of Society that embraces all sides of life.

"Detroit the Dynamic"

By CARL NOLD

DETROIT, twenty-five years ago, looked to me like a quiet, peaceful town of about half a million inhabitants. One could cross streets all day long without getting killed. Today we kill about one each day and send two score to the hospitals. Ford made about fifty automobiles a day, and that those tin boxes ran is still a riddle to me: they were made by unskilled men working ten and one-half hours a day for $2.50. Ignorant foremen tried to get the most out of the workers, with the result that each week about one-fourth of the force quit and the next week new men had to be broken in.

A few years later, when Ford moved into his new factory, he surprised the world with the news that the lowest wages to be paid would be $5.00 for eight hours. Some thought it charitable, but it soon proved to be a well-figured-out scheme. At five dollars a day the best help could be hired and men depended on to stick to the job. No more waste in breaking in hundreds of new men each week. Men came from every part of the land to Detroit for a five-dollar-a-day job at Ford's. The crowds at the factory became so insistent that on one cold winter day the firemen had to turn the hose on them to drive them away with ice cold water. However, they still came. Detroit was growing. New factories opened up.

Ford, like a good father, took care of his men. His agents and spies saw to it that the slaves could not organize. They went into the private dwellings of the workers, to inspect them, their wives and children, the boarders, the bank books, to smell around for beer and tobacco. Some workers kicked, most of them tolerated it because the general idea prevailed that if a man worked for Ford he was taken care of for the rest of his life. Why need they organize? People still flocked to Detroit. The land-sharks did their best harvesting. "A million inhabitants" was the cry of "Dynamic Detroit." They had not yet learned the lesson that the bigger the city, the bigger the corruption in the city government, the bigger the slums and the greater the general misery.

Big business, that made millions each year, was not satisfied; the leaders organized and for several years spent each year $1,000,000 to "advertise Detroit." And more people came to Detroit to find out that there were too many here already.

Labor saving devices had actually riveted the men to their machines. They had no more time to pull out their handkerchiefs to wipe the sweat from their faces on a hot summer day. Many threw down their tools saying they would rather work on the road for three dollars than for Ford for five. But whenever Ford hired a hundred men, the newspapers reported a thousand hired. When five thousand were laid off, no paper would report it.

There were some who became doubtful of these insane conditions and predicted that some day the "saturation point" would be reached. Ford, who had become a never failing oracle, was the first to deny it, on the theory that if there are 25,000,000 autos running in America, 5,000,000 must be replaced each year and this will keep the business going in a continuous circle. Of course, the oracle forgot that every once in a while a depression upsets calculations.

The saturation point was reached three years ago. The factories started to lay off, and no mercy was shown. Men who had held their positions for ten and fifteen years were suddenly discharged without warning or explanation, or replaced by cheaper men. Today there are in Michigan 100,000 fewer automobiles running than two years ago. This is equally true of every other state, with the result that millions of autos that should have been replaced have not been replaced. The Detroit factories are actually closed. All the bragging we read in the papers about orders piling up during the automobile shows in Detroit, New York and Chicago in 1931 and 1932 proved to be downright lies. Thirty thousand families are today on the welfare list of Detroit, while another sixty thousand would like to be.

Last summer Senator Couzens of Detroit realized that at least $10,000,000 would be necessary to support the jobless of Detroit during this winter, and he offered a contribution of $1,000,000 if the other millionaires of Detroit would do likewise. It is significant that none followed suit.

Ford's prediction that the saturation point would never be reached and that Hoover would be elected is exploded. His attack on the Jews, the ice-water on the job-seekers, his bigoted stand on prohibition, his spy system in the factory, the massacre last February, and his attempt to "advise" the men how to vote have given him and his factory the worst reputation in America, and "Detroit the Dynamic" is on the bum!

Education

By ALEXIS C. FERM

REMAKERS OF MANKIND is the result of a round-the-world trip by Carleton Washburne, inquiring into the educational ideas and methods of the various countries. Both his interviews and his own conclusions are interesting. He says: "The Shinto attitude toward family, emperor and nation . . . is the dominant note in all Japanese education," and also that there is no dream of "replacing or in any way diminishing nationalistic patriotism."

Of China he says that she is individualistic, and that "for all her desire for unity she has no craving for the Japanese extreme of nationalism."

Of the Russians' ideals in education he says: "Their loyalty is to their class, to the revolution, to the communist ideal. Their aim is . . . a communist state which is world wide."

He reports that Mahatma Gandhi puts character-building as the goal in education when India obtains self-rule. Gandhi says: "I would try to develop courage, strength, virtue, the ability to forget oneself in working for great aims. This is more important than literacy."

Mr. Washburne's appeal in regard to our own country is for "thinking, growing individuals who . . . cannot be produced by indoctrination," but who "have formed the habit of approaching life reasonably and fearlessly, with open eyes and open minds."

* * *

W. E. BROKAW of *The Equitist* writes: "In the April issue you say, . . . 'we do not want them to develop that kind of rugged individualism that makes them think that they have the privilege of getting the best of anybody or everybody. . . Why should they not get satisfaction while young in the things that belong to them, while we take good care that we do not let them get the impression that they should or can get their satisfaction at the expense of the rest of the household?' I answer that the material and psychological environment in which they live is shaped by the system of ownership and exchange we practice. Prices of everything are fixed by a unit which puts price on what is not human work, thus *compelling* some to work for others without being worked for in return—and, vice versa, compelling the others to be worked for without working in return. That inevitably concentrates ownership in the control of those who own for their incomes and strips it from those who work for their incomes. Everything bought and sold is thus priced. It compels us to seek advantage in exchange, and the most necessitous is at a disadvantage. That is how supply and demand (whether controlled by monopoly or not) determines prices. In such an environment it is out of the question to prevent the young from seeing that satisfaction can be best obtained by getting it at the expense of others. One must be either a master or a slave. There is no other alternative. Hence the importance of understanding the Equitist Way—of Equitable Exchange."

I recognize the difficulty, but if nothing can be done to broaden the child's outlook beyond our present conditions until we have social equity then it seems to me that there is very little hope of ever getting any justice in our social life. If we cannot get the young to grow up with some thinking faculties that will help them to see beyond their petty selves from the standpoint of their larger selves to their relationship with the social body, there is no hope for mankind. We shall simply continue to repeat domination, cruelty and exploitation in other forms. We shall have change of form in our society, but the essence of the attitude of one human being toward another will remain the same. "You must think as I do or go to hell." In the name of civilization we may throw our opponents into jail if they do not agree with our method of accomplishing the revolution. That is how all revolutions so far have been accomplished, but the ideal of the revolution has never been attained.

I am referring now not to Brokaw's idea of a revolution, but to the attitude of revolutionists in general. Brokaw thinks that the change can be brought about only through propaganda until the majority agree to change. If in the meantime children are not helped to do some thinking and judging for themselves there will be little hope of ever accomplishing anything with adults. There are always some adults who somehow manage to retain enough of their childhood to keep "open eyes and open minds" and who are willing to give thought to social questions. But even they are hampered by the lack of having exercised their thinking faculties while young —I mean thinking in their own way, not in ours.

I have reference particularly to the attitude towards the child in the home. So much is accomplished in those very early years that it is very important how we treat the young before they go out to battle with the world.

We recently had a visit from two young friends who were enjoying the possession of their first-born, a child a little over a year old. His eyes were almost constantly turned up towards the leaves of the trees as they were gently moving in the breeze, or towards other large objects that did not seem to us to be outstanding. The father, who wants to be as little of a hindrance as possible to the child's development, could nevertheless not help calling his attention to a yellow flower or to some other outstanding object in the grass that he thought the child should see, and that he could help him to see, thus diverting him from the thing in which he was interested. But what the child saw seemed to have nothing to do with what the father thought he should see, or what were outstanding objects to us.

We cannot tell what it is that a child gets from his long and continued stare at one object, as if he were trying to take it all in. Whatever mind he may have, it seems to puzzle over that which he observes. Why should we think that he could get more out of that which we want him to observe? He seems to have concentration, which we want to break up, or which, ignorantly, we do break up. It was interesting to see how little this child saw in the thing to which his attention was called, and how much he seemed to see in those things at which he looked when undisturbed. He would return again and again to the thing he saw without our help. He had initiative.

Here we have the beginning of diversion just when the child is growing mentally and physically most rapidly. Who can tell how much that early diversion has to do with the restlessness and lack of concentration in later life?

* * *

Anarchist schools have been mentioned as possibilities of the Anarchist movement. So then we are to follow in the footsteps of the church, the Communists, and all the reactionaries. We are to teach the young how to be Anarchists. With all this hub-bub around them we are not to make an environment where they may grow into freedom-loving individuals; they are not to be trusted to follow their innate instincts for freedom, if you will pardon the expression, but they are to be given a name, a label, so that when they call themselves "Anarchists" they may think that that is enough. It is so much easier to carry a label than to be the thing that the label signifies. It is easier to mouth a word than to think out a situation, to understand what is required in a condition of freedom.

When the movement for freedom was in its infancy the new converts smoked in your face in a stuffy room, kept their hats on during a lecture so that you could not see the speaker, stalked down the room while the speaker was talking, and in other crude forms and manners manifested their ideas of freedom, and then called themselves Communist-Anarchists. I suppose that most of that has passed, though not entirely. Men and women who become Anarchists now do so through their own thinking, not by way of propaganda. Propaganda is mostly confined to methods of procedure, the future state of society, or the meaning of words and terms. The love of freedom is a becoming, not a conversion. Anarchist schools for adults are understandable, but not for children. All that the adult can do for the education of the young is to foster the spirit of freedom in the schools and to establish schools where the freedom of the child in his growth will be the paramount idea. The moment you label a children's school "Anarchist" it no longer stands for freedom. Just think it over.

Anarchism

By JULES SCARCERIAUX

"IF IT were true that all forms of government rest on violence, and that therefore all are wrong and harmful as well as unnecessary, the fact would be known by writers, at least by talented writers, and through their work it would also be known by the masses. Why is this not the case?"

There is nothing surprising in the fact that writers generally have nothing to do with the anarchist philosophy. Most of them, ninety-nine per cent at least, don't know anything about the origin of government and ignore the real facts concerning its existence.

In the first place, a great many writers have behind them the drive of need, always reflected in their writing. Their fertility and keenness, their imaginative faculties are dominated by one of nature's weaknesses: the desire for comfort and life's luxuries. What prevails in their minds is not truth, but dollars. They are trained, not to make use of their abilities for the benefit of mankind, (interview the cub reporter), but to get money and popularity which, again, means more money; trained not to bring out real facts wanted only by the few, but stupefying matter required by the many.

As Newman wrote, for these writers there is a division between thought and "work," the interests of thought clashing with the desire to sell the products of the pen That is why writers ignore the anarchist philosophy. It doesn't pay! On the other hand, writers of genius in the truest sense—Bakunin, Kropotkin, Reclus—have generally been men of means, men brought up in an environment free of financial struggle, men not trained to obedience to the drive of need, not corruptible by the wish for comfort, or the passion for money. Besides these, men with keen minds and faculties who write truthfully and interestingly are to be found among those who, with aching arms and weary backs, stiffened with dirt and sweat, still find time to handle a pen: Malatesta, Jean Grave, and others. All of these, however, have a creative purpose, and, to quote from D. Lippman's *Honest Workmanship*, "Let a human being throw the energies of his soul into the making of something and the instinct of workmanship will take care of his honesty. . . . The writers who have nothing to say are the ones you can buy; the others have too high a price. A genuine craftsman will not adulterate his products; the reason isn't because duty says he shouldn't but because passion say he couldn't."

(Continued on page 5)

FREEDOM
Successor to ROAD TO FREEDOM
A Weekly Journal of Anarchist News and Opinion
Published Weekly by
Road to Freedom Publishing Ass'n
219 Second Avenue, New York City
EDITORS
L. RAYMOND HARRY KELLY
Application for second class matter pending
* * *
Single copies Five Cents; $2.00 a year

Notes and Comments

THE opinion of Felix Frankfurter on matters of jurisprudence is always interesting because of his courageous liberalism as well as his knowledge. However, we can not help but feel that when he writes of the U. S. Supreme Court decision in the Scottsboro case as if a new epoch has opened that his wish is father to the thought.

It was a race question pure and simple. The communists deserve credit for taking up the case with their characteristic zeal. But when they introduced the question of class into the case they introduced a factor which had no place there whatever. Poor white boys or workingmen would never have been sentenced to death for the same offence, and everyone knows it. Negroes of property have been lynched as ruthlessly as penniless ones, and every unbiased person who has been in the South and has studied this case has testified to the bitterness of the poorest whites against these Negro boys. The members of the Supreme Court were removed from the scene and were, therefore, able to consider the case objectively. For this reason this commentator never doubted that the Court would decide as it did. The point that Prof. Frankfurter and other liberals like Dr. Harry Elmer Barnes overlook is that the very same judges of the U. S. Supreme Court would deny a new trial for Sacco and Vanzetti, and Mooney and Billings, if these cases were brought before them. They would do this because they are subject to the race bias. The presumption of innocence in these cases was just as great as in the Scottsboro one and the publicity far greater, yet not a single judge or high official even expressed an opinion that the men might be innocent. In so far as seven human lives have been saved, temporarily at least, we are glad, but it will take a great deal more than this decision to make us believe that jurisprudence has been liberalized.

* * *

When men, women and children are suffering for lack of the necessities of life as they are at present, it is hard to see things which at other times would stare us in the face. It seems like yesterday when men like Gompers and Green expressed themselves in terms so similar to the late and unlamented Judge Gary that they could have exchanged speeches at a Civic Federation banquet without anyone knowing who was who. And now Mr. Green talks of "the five day week and six hour day on a nationwide scale as a step in the right direction." Shades of Kropotkin and William Morris! Isn't this but a step from "the philosophy of the heap" with each according to his ability to each according to his needs? If a thirty-hour week is "but a step in the right direction" it cannot be far from the time when we shall be a nation of philosophers or neurasthenics. From time to time when fate or fortune drives us to the suburbs we see a garden and fountain where a small stream of water tosses a rubber ball in the air for hours on end. Is it possible that some such simple device will operate industry and enable man to put his mind to higher things, say to making love or studying philosophy, for instance, or both. We wonder.

* * *

A generation ago—twenty-two years to be exact—when the Francisco Ferrer Association opened its doors in an indifferent city, comparatively few people in New York and elsewhere were interested in libertarian or even progressive education for children. In fact it was *infra dig* for teachers to take part in the general social movement. On November 18-19 a regional conference of the Progressive Education Association was held at the Hotel Pennsylvania and from 1500 to 2000 men and women attended and applauded sentiments which would have been heretical fifteen or twenty years ago. The burden of the speeches delivered by Prof. Kilpatrick, Bruce Bliven, Van Loon, Dr. Williams and others was the imperative need for teachers and those engaged in educational work to take their places in the great movement of rebuilding society. No light and fluffy twaddle about "honest government, independent judiciary, or fearless officials," like Mayor McKee, who want to revolutionize men's habits and leave general conditions alone; but plain statements that capitalism is breaking down and teachers as part of the community have an important part to play in this great upheaval which is taking place now. It has often seemed to us that teachers associating as they do with children take on a child's mind and assume a child's attitude toward life. Perhaps the world is growing after all. Certain it is that the Progressive Education Association is a most encouraging sign of the time, and we hope that the revolution will proceed more rapidly in the future than it has in the past. In the meantime we would say to progressive education and social reformers that the principle laid down in the Stelton and Mohegan colonies, where the School is the center of all intellectual activity, is open to all and might be followed with great benefit in other communities.

* * *

The principle of rugged individualism received a bad swat in the eye when the Great Engineer was given four months notice to leave. But in spite of this we feel like breaking a lance for the principle now and then. Recent news from Chicago told that Martin Miller, homeless and hungry, had himself arrested and then told the judge—"If you don't lock me up I'll smash every window in the police station." The judge, not knowing what else to do, gave him 53 days. Jails are not the most agreeable places to pass one's time in, but they provide food and shelter—of a kind—and Miller was sure of at least fifty-three days in which he could keep body and soul together without much effort. Following this we saw "Vanity Street" a moving picture in which a young girl from the country came to New York, where she did not, contrary to all precedent, make good. In fact she was hungry to the point of starvation and had no place to sleep. But she had initiative, and threw a brick through a drug store window. When she was arrested she made much the same remark as Mr. Miller of Chicago. The author of the scenario rewarded her with a job in the Follies as well as a husband. Hence the moral: if you are hungry and homeless get arrested, and if you do so in sufficient numbers at one time there will not be enough jails; and then something is bound to happen.

* * *

A great many people, perhaps a majority, in Europe and the U. S. have been weeping over the war debts and assuming that if they are scrapped or cancelled everything will be O. K. Harry Elmer Barnes in a recent number of the *World-Telegram* has called attention to a phase of this question that should be read by every radical and revolutionist, for it will help a great deal toward clear thinking. The interest due on the war debts December 15th amounts to one hundred and twenty-three million, six hundred and forty-one thousand, six hundred and ninety-eight dollars ($123,641,698.00). A tidy sum that, but what about this? The expenditures for future wars for the last fiscal year, or for the last year for which figures were available, were one billion, six hundred and seventeen million, seven hundren and twenty thousand dollars ($1,617,720,000). Readers of this item with a mathematical turn of mind are invited to figure it. As we see it, in round numbers, twelve times as much money was spent on armaments during the last year as the interest due on December 15th which they are weeping so much about. Fascist Italy, with millions under the heel of Mussolini and his thugs, spent no less than three hundred and thirty-one million, six hundred thousand dollars on armaments, whereas they have to meet only one million, two hundred and forty-five, thousand four hundred and thirty-seven dollars in interest; Great Britain while telling the world of the dire consequences which will result if the United States should demand payment of the ninety-five million, five hundred and fifty thousand dollars interest due, spent no less than five hundred and twenty-seven million, five hundred thousand dollars on armaments; and France with only nineteen million, two hundred and sixty-one thousand four hundred and thirty-eight dollars due, spent the colossal sum of five hundred and forty-one million, three hundred thousand dollars for future wars. In other words, Great Britain spent five and one-half times, France twenty-eight times, as much, and Italy more than two hundred sixty times as much as the interest due. Incidentally, the *World-Telegram* of New York had an editorial a few days ago entitled, "Viva Italia," complimenting Italy on announcing that she intended to meet the interest payment when due. Marvelous isn't it? You spend one dollar to meet debts and two hundred and sixty dollars on armaments; and this is considered so remarkable as to bring commendation. If all of us would talk less of war debts and more of war expenditures it might help clear the air and enable us to deal intelligently with the situation. Wipe out the war debts, of course, but what good will it do if nations continue to spend more than a billion and a half dollars a year on war preparation?

* * *

In connection with the above here is an item dealing with the sacred cow Interest. Writing on the war debts, a Mr. Howard T. Oliver says in the New York *Times* of November 24th, "The total loans originally amounted to ten billion, three hundred and thirty-eight million dollars. Of this sum seven hundred and twenty-six million has been paid on the principal and one billion, nine hundred and two million in interest, totalling two billion, eight hundred and twenty-eight million." Had there been no interest, he says, one-fourth of the debt would have been paid to date. "In the funding of the original debt the principal became eleven billion, five hundred and sixty-five million, and the interest ten billion, six hundred and twenty-three millions, more than doubling the original amounts loaned."

The City of New York built a subway some years ago with borrowed money for which were issued bonds payable in four years. The present subway debt is five hundred and ninety million dollars. A few weeks ago the Board of Estimate, responding to a clamour for lower taxes, revised the city budget; not wanting to interfere with sinecures and graft of "deserving" Democrats, decided to issue bonds maturing in fifty years to replace the four year bonds. By the time these bonds are paid each dollar spent on the subway will have increased to no less than

seven dollars and ten cents. In other words, a debt of five hundred and ninety million dollars will have grown to four billion, one hundred and ninety-two million. If we consider that the present generation is bringing a new generation into the world without consulting it, it seems to us a pretty low down trick to saddle them with such frightful debts due to nothing but our own cowardice and stupidity. The holder of the war and subway bonds mentioned above need not toil or spin but tear off strips of paper each month or year and live off them. And yet strange as it may sound not one person out of a hundred questions this sacred cow called interest. Wages may be reduced on the ground that the cost of living has gone down and a dollar will buy more than it did in 1929; but a dollar loaned in 1929 carries the same amount of interest as before. The debt being loaded on the future generation grows larger and larger and yet nothing is being done about it.

* * *

At this writing it looks as if Norman Thomas will have polled about nine hundred thousand votes. This, while considerable, is far less than the socialists expected. Twenty years ago, before women had the vote, Eugene Debs polled nearly a million votes. On this basis, and because of an increased population, Thomas should have received at least two and a half million votes. Not believing in votes, we are not inclined to hold this against the socialists. There is one thing, however, we would call attention to, and it is this. At the convention of the Socialist Party, held several months ago, the secretary reported a paid up membership of something over twenty-five thousand. If twenty-five thousand members produced nine hundred thousand votes each member of the party brought thirty-five other men or women to the polls. Now, no matter what we think of voting, we must admit that bringing thirty-five voters to the polls is quite a job, and we compliment the socialists for their energy even though we think the energy could have been put to better use. A proportionate amount of energy on the part of the anarchists might help create a real libertarian movement in this country, which is a thing devoutly to be wished.

H. K.

Greetings

Dear Harry:

Your letter asking for an article for the new Anarchist Weekly reached me only today. To have it in Cherbourg for the next sailing, the 23rd, I'd have to post the article tomorrow morning. For it takes three days and sometimes more for mail to reach any part of France from here. You can see the utter impossibility of dashing off an article at such short notice.

Some people claim they find writing easy. They can do it any time, just awakened from sleep, or standing on one toe as it were. I don't know whether the world of Letters gains or loses by such literary manufacture. I only know I can't do it. Writing to me is a difficult process. I need time and much thought. I have neither at this moment.

However, I do not want you and the comrades to think I am indifferent to the proposed venture. On the contrary. I consider a militant Anarchist weekly journal in the United States of the utmost importance. And I congratulate you all on the pluck to start a publication on what our good old friend Bolton Hall used to call "patience and postage stamps." I know you will not lack the former. But judging by the capital you mention as so far raised, I fear you'll run short all too quickly of the latter. I can only hope—since prayers from so great a heathen as I am will not avail—that the comrades all over America will rally to the support of the undertaking.

The fanfare and screeching noise of Dictatorship from the Right as well as the Left have well nigh drowned the Leitmotif in the call for freedom and revolt ever recurrent in Anarchism. The masses have been caught in the modern religious hysteria, prostrate before the State—their new saviour. They are blind to the cloven hoofs of the cold monster trampling over them. And crushing, relentlessly crushing, every Libertarian value but yesteryear held high.

More reason for a clear, strong and fearless voice that will help the masses to bethink themselves. A voice that will make them realize the urgent need of organized, co-operative effort to stay the pernicious march of Dictatorship.

May the new Weekly become that voice — the trumpet call to battle for Anarchism—the only social order that will free enslaved and suffering humanity.

EMMA GOLDMAN

St. Tropez, Var, France
November 19, 1932

Nice, Nov. 20, 1932

Dear Harry:

E. G. has just sent me from St. Tropez the letter she received from you and in which you request an article or greeting for the new paper.

Today is the 20th of November and your paper is to go on the press, as you say, on the 27th. There is hardly time to reach you. I wonder why you did not write about it before.

In order to catch the next boat for the U. S. I can send you only a short greeting. I certainly wish you and the comrades all success with the new undertaking, and I hope it will be a weekly. What we need is more confidence and energy on the part of our people, greater will to assert ourselves.

We live at a time of great reaction and crisis. True enough. But is that reason for neglecting our propaganda? It seems to me that just the contrary should be the case. Greater effort, more energy and work are necessary just because of the present situation.

I think that the paper our comrades are about to publish should be a revolutionary labor weekly of clear Anarchist tendency, something perhaps like the *Blast* which I published in San Francisco. It should speak a plain, popular language, one that is understood by the average workingman. There is no philosophy so deep that it cannot be explained in the simplest terms. Moreover, don't feed your readers on philosophy and theory. Make your paper *live*. Deal with the vital every-day life and its problems. Speak *ad hominem*, directly, fearlessly and straight to the heart and mind. Only thus you will be able to interest the greater number of readers.

It seems to me that particularly at this time the people everywhere are thirsty for clear and definite words. Even the greatest moron can't help *feeling* his position, even if he can't understand the why and wherefore. It is up to the planned paper to make that clear to him. Almost everyone realizes that there is something wrong with present conditions. It is up to your paper to point out *what is wrong*, to point out strongly and plainly, without mincing words and unafraid of strong language where necessary.

I consider the present a more favorable time than ever before for the propaganda and spread of our ideas. Capitalism is in a blind alley and government everywhere is at a loss what to do about it. The complete failure of our industrial civilization is being tacitly admitted even by some conservative elements. Millions of men and women in every country are jobless and miserable. Psychologically it is the very moment to enlighten the masses about the causes and sources of the general breakdown. But you can't do it with the old traditional phrases and high-falutin' theories. You have to devise a new language and a new manner of presenting our view of the social troubles. That is the main purpose of the planned paper.

Write your paper for the workers and get it to them. If our people are interested in the success of the paper, they have to get it to the workers. I am sick of papers written only for our own small crowd. They are born dead. And don't forget that a vital publication must have a clear and definite face. It has to have personality, just like a human being, if it is to be effective. You mention three comrades as the suggested editors. I don't know whether you mean that the paper is to be edited by the committee of three, or by one of the three. I have always held that *one* good editor is better than three incompetent ones. With three editors a paper cannot have a distinct character.

I wish you and the comrades the best success in this undertaking. And if I can be of help, I shall gladly do it.

Fraternally,

ALEXANDER BERKMAN

22, Avenue Mon Plaisir
Nice (A.M.), France

Dear Harry:

I should like to have written something for the first number of your magazine, but I just haven't had the time or opportunity. It should be a timely undertaking. It would be interesting to discover to what extent anarchism as a philosophy is still current in contemporary thought, to what extent anarchism, though discredited as a movement (after all anarchism is more an attitude than a political program) still lives in the ideas of people of today. It would be interesting to speculate for example, how far Kropotkin's ideas on scientific management and agriculture have influenced the group of engineers in this country advocating "technocracy," or the group with Orage in England advocating certain radical economic changes. Again, it would be interesting to discover how many libertarian ideas of education are still alive and vital in the many experimental schools of today, ever since the Ferrer Modern School was started, one of the pioneers in the field.

All this and more I hope to find treated in the pages of the new magazine.

Best wishes,

CARL ZIGROSSER

November 30, 1932

ANARCHISM

(*Continued from page* 3)

Those men who have too high a price never yield, but stand ever as the best, the most productive, the most worthy and the most radical. Their genuine craftsmanship is not alone due to their passion for truth, but to the depth of their understanding and the range of their sympathy for their fellowmen.

In conclusion, we maintain and repeat that all forms of government rest on violence, and that therefore all are wrong and harmful, as well as unnecessary—this not withstanding the fact that talented writers do not always recognize it. We assert that for the realization of a free society we must learn, teach, serve as examples, sharpen our brains —our most precious tools. The unceasing craving for freedom, despite the silence of many, despite slow results, will finally break through the shell that hinders the struggle toward a better social life, toward Anarchism.

War Resistance

By RODERICK SEIDENBERG

CONSCRIPTION during the World War brought forth from the depths of the masses a scattering of war resisters. Neither their presence nor their number was surprising. By the mathematical law of averages, the drag-net of conscription might well have brought to the surface an even greater number of queer fish; the unanimity of American behavior was an ominous tribute to the power of fear. But in this meagre scattering of individual objectors, conscription succeeded, by its very sweep, in creating the nucleus of an anti-toxin. Since the days of 1917 this faint fringe of war resistance has spread into an unexpected and formidable obstacle to war. It has penetrated, by a kind of spontaneous development, deeper and deeper into the inert mass of men. The principles underlying this direct action against war have become clearer, more convincing and inevitable. The course of history has justified them; and the rising tide of disillusionment, if not despair, has endowed them with a strength difficult to estimate.

From the example of a few individuals a movement has arisen. It is natural to ask what is the power of this movement, from where does it draw its strength, what will be its role in the next conflict? To these questions there can be no definite answer. Moreover, the questions do not reach the heart of the problem; they tend to confuse the meaning, or perhaps it would be better to say, the motivation of war resistance. For the principles of war resistance draw their strength not from the vain hope of abolishing war, but from the realization, in one sense or another, of a way of life. The significance of war resistance—and in the last analysis its strength as well—lies in its emphasis upon motive above result. Unlike war, it represents a means in harmony with its end. Thus it can *never* fail in the sense in which war must *always* fail: in achieving its ends. War resistance is a principle, not a device; this is the source of its triumph.

In war, the state reaches its highest moment of power, while the individual suffers a total eclipse. He is as nothing, that the state may be all. At the moment when he is asked to surrender his life in the absolutism of the state, he is deprived of his last vestige of choice. He chooses to die—under penalty of death! If in the last war the resister was spared the ultimate consequences of his actions, he was favored by good fortune. In the next war he may feel the full force of his challenge to the state, as the resisters of France and Germany suffered the ultimate penalty in the last holocaust. An increase in his numbers may only precipitate a more fearful and barbarous attitude toward his principles, and he may be decimated cold-bloodedly to ensure the unity of those who remain. Yet, as the burden of this butchery increases, it puts an unbearable strain of righteousness upon the state which no amount of propaganda, of invidious idealism, can at last absorb. Thus the state, built upon the confidence, the loyalty and faith of its subjects, fears the uncertain moment when its balance may be suddenly put in jeopardy by the strain of an unexpected opposition from within. For the real power of war resistance lies in its accessibility to all alike. And as war becomes more deadly, as the element of gamble, upon which alone it can successfully be foisted upon the public, is progressively lessened under the destructive powers of modern weapons, of poison gas, of lethal air attacks, of disease and pestilence, it is not unlikely that men may feel impelled to die bravely in opposition rather than weakly under compulsion. The certainty of death will release them from the bondage of their illusions, and in that hour they may forsake the state whose higher aggression demands their extinction.

Finally, let us remember that while the soldier fights merely the enemy's armament, the war resister fights directly the ideas he opposes. His refusal to participate is in itself an explosive idea which must continue to spread, gathering momentum as it becomes acceptable to the minds of men. Both war and resistance to war are gambles from the point of view of immediate achievement, but the latter becomes ever less a gamble as the number who share its principles increases, while the former becomes at last an utter madness as the world plunges deeper into chaos. So long as men are willing to gamble their lives, they will win only death.

The hope of permanent international peace may be illusory. Whatever the roads that lead to this ultimate ideal, war resistance is the most direct and unequivocal. Its motives cannot be misinterpreted. But if we fail in our attempt to reach this goal, we cannot fail to establish the quality of our peace and the direction of our efforts. As the power of the state drifts inevitably toward death, whether in war or in peace, it devolves upon the individual and upon society to re-assert the fundamental right to life. In abandoning that right, men invite destruction; in war, demented by the lust of the state, they court extinction. Out of that madness must arise, clear and sharp, the calm courage of sanity. Let us refuse to die merely that the state may live.

The Burden of Graft in City Government

By S. W. SIMPSON

ONE of the editors asks for a short article on "the financial situation of New York," saying that he knows it to be typical of that of most large cities. He tells me further that about a third of the budget of New York City is necessitated by fixed charges, which is well within the truth.

The budget of this great city for this year calls for the expenditure of some $700,000,000. The funded debt of the city when last reported, only a few months ago, and now somewhat increased, was $2,314,220,000; so that what is called "service of the debt," meaning the annual interest on it, takes nearly or perhaps quite $100,000,000. The total fixed payroll for this year amounts to $368,695,000. When we add those two items of fixed charges together we find that their sum is almost exactly two-thirds of the budget.

Of the total payroll, $168,000,000 is mandatory; it goes to firemen, policemen, and teachers. It can be reduced only by new legislation at Albany; and it ought not to be reduced at all. Of the rest, $29,000,000 is called semi-mandatory. It is paid to officials holding jobs of a permanent nature that are well-paid though not as highly as are the political sinecures; we need hardly worry about them. The rest ought to hold our attention—$171,695,000 paid mostly for nothing to such gentlemen as the late-mayor Mr. Jimmy Walker ($40,000 by his own order), the judges-to-be Hofstadter and Steuer (each $25,000), and many pure chair-warmers, who collect from $10,000 to $20,000 and do little more than sign receipts for it. Let us ask, and keep on asking, why the members of an alleged democracy whose hard-earned incomes average less than $2000 should pay their alleged servants from five to ten times as much, even when they do something to earn it, if they do or can.

The city of New York is a corporation chartered by the legislature in a manner similar to that of any ordinary business corporation. Its capital must be considered the ground it is built on plus such docks, subways, etc., as it has built and still owns as a corporation, and such powers as it has to levy taxes and fines and to exact fees. None of these powers is properly used. The groundrent of the city is alone worth more than a billion dollars a year; and the people pay its full worth to someone but not to the city. I said more than a billion, and I mean that; but compare only an even billion with the total budget. You will observe that if the city collected its groundrent it should not need to levy a cent's worth of taxes or fines or fees. It prefers to support millionaires and lesser paupers with the 300-million and more dollars a year that go to our present-day visitors Lord and Lady Astor and the rest of the "nobility" of their class of landlords. Imagine an ordinary business corporation earning a billion dollars a year letting a few of its members get away with half the earnings and then having to assess or fine the rest, the great body of members, to keep the concern going.

That is exactly what the corporation of New York does with what ought to be its own income. It is because this income is insufficient to meet the budget that we read in the news of the conditions demanded by bankers when the city needs to borrow for its needs. But let calculating readers assume that income and budget are equal, and make such calculations as they wish from these data. The income is derived: 14.5 per cent from dock and other rents, fees, and fines; 12.6 per cent from the state school fund; .2 per cent from a personal-property tax; and 72.7 per cent from the tax on real estate. There is a great howl by "realtors" about the last-named big percentage; and it is truly a large item. The trouble is that it is wrongly levied. The larger part of it ought not to appear at all—that is the tax on buildings and other improvements. It is that tax that enables the nobility of landlords to levy on all the other members of the corporation, and subjects these others to the oppression of disemployment and poverty. Of the tax on "real estate" three-quarters or more falls on improvements (buildings, etc.), and the shifting of this to rent-payers supports landlordism—provides the means for holding idle land out of use, promotes speculation in land, denies opportunity to the disemployed, and makes everything we must buy cost two or three times as much as it should under conditions of freedom. Every resident of the city is a member of the corporation fined for the support of his or her own oppression.

If our city corporation would collect its own earnings honestly for the benefit of all its shareholders other benefits would ensue; for it is always true that like begets like. Prosperity can not be got out of adversity, a maxim that ought to be pounded into politicians. What a chance! Long have we heard of the great gods Rent, Interest, and Profit. Groundrent is the grandparent of the others. Confiscating groundrent would put us in the way of developing free banking, so of reducing interest to the mere cost of insurance against loss, perhaps a half of one percent a year; and this would lead to the diffusion of ownership and the abolition of profiteering. If every member of a society were the equal owner of its total wealth there could be no such thing as profit except by the exchange of facility. That is the only honest profit a real freeman can see. Anything I can do better than you exchanged for anything you can do better than I brings profit to both of us, the only profit truly civilized men and women ought to seek.

I have had to indite this matter hastily under difficulties. My best hope is that it may offer a few crumbs to ruminants.

Revolt in the Theatre

By M. JAGENDORF

THE reward of thinking on the part of individual human beings has generally been burning at the stake, a ride to the guillotine, close contact with the block and ax, or the hangman's noose. In a way, this generous consideration of man's daring in mental activity holds true in any kind of individual thinking and therefore applies to Broadway, the towering symbol of drama in America.

The compensation of an idea in the theater contrary to that of the mass of patrons and producers is oblivion. Failure. Financial Failure. Since the life of a drama on Broadway depends almost wholly on the box office the plays must perforce be judged by it; artistically it is something quite different.

A play cannot be put into a museum, public or private. To be living, to be at all, it must be acted. Taken off the stage it cannot be called drama in the strict sense. To read a play by yourself is a contradiction. We must start off with the premises that it is a living thing only when it is acted before an audience and that when it is not acted it ceases to exist. It decomposes into vegetating closet drama. Now, when such a living drama contains an original thought, a disturbing idea that stirs and rakes up and forces the mind out of its stagnating rut of daily commonplaces it is thrown out of the theatre. Which is another form of guillotine or hangman's noose.

I mean palpitating, vibrating ideas, such as make you realize the absurdity of acts, the hypocrisy of our daily existence, the cheap lie of social behavior, or the gruesome irony of religion. I do not mean the saccharine palaver that is fed to the average bourgeois mind called thinking, or the flattering trick of dressing commonplace, second-hand encyclopedic ideas to make them look like outgrowths of a profound mind. This type of make-believe, idealful play bears the same relation that Descarte, a real philosopher bears to some modern commentators, who at best are only second-hand encyclopedias of information, dressed in honey-coated journalistic style.

Here is an example. There is a play running now by Rachel Crothers called "When Ladies Meet," which is an enormous success. Every audience spreads the gospel that here is a play packed with ideas that provoke thinking. The story is a simple one. A young woman author solves all the difficulties of the eternal triangle in a novel. The manner in which a man, wife, and lover would act if they found love gone from their lives. She falls in love with a married man and finds that neither the wife of her lover nor her lover acts the way she thought they would. Moreover, she herself acts differently from the way she depicted in her novel. She and the wife discuss the man, find him hardly worth their august devotion, and drop him.

Every good housewife from the suburbs dreams herself in the role of the soulful wife or lady author, and the result is three matinees every week to accommodate the surging crowds. The formula here is a simple one. A successful lady author, a betrayed and deep-thinking wife (?) acting the proud heroine, and a man who is a puppet. All is covered with vanilla-and-chocolaty so-called human philosophy, and is swallowed as noble and deep thought. Artificial situations are created which every woman would like to live, if not in reality, at least in the dream existence. And the life of the play is a long and happy one.

There is another play that opened a few weeks before, called "Men Must Fight." The play had a vibrating idea that forced tortuous thinking. It dealt with a family that had gone through the 1914-1918 world massacre, and had become passionate pacifists. Particularly the wife, whose lover had been killed in an aeroplane. As a result of the love came a son. Through the years she had hammered into her son the uselessness of war. The action is now 1940. War is wrong under any circumstance, as rational human beings can always arbitrate. Then the test comes. A new war, caused as usual by some stupid economic piffle, and the son goes out to fight. He follows a deep-rooted inherent call, the mob suggestion, and the goading of the girl he loves. The play was perfectly acted and perfectly staged and was a perfect flop. It was off the boards in a few weeks. For here was a play that had an irritating idea. It provoked argument and showed us up in none-too-flattering terms. It dug pins into our smug, satisfied vanities, and the audience balked and said thumbs down. So thumbs down it was, and "Men Must Fight" died a swift death.

Remember I do not say here that success is a definite criterion in measuring the art of drama. I am speaking purely from the theatre point of view. Greatness in the arts of painting, music, literature, and political thought is recognized by a very few. It does not need the appreciation of the crowd. With the drama, the most popular of the arts existant today, it is entirely different. That needs the crowd to sustain it. It is a mirror of the time. And alas! the reflection is very poor. There is even a greater depression in the drama than in finances. Instead of the palpitating, free, fearless expression that it was, it has become the machine-made, dull, commonplace, unspeakable movie grunting. Works like "Men Must Fight" have no chance. "Success Story," the only play on today that says something real, crying out tensely against a certain aspect of life, is supported solely by the radical element—and it is the only one of its kind in about thirty-five plays.

It is conclusive proof of one of two facts: Either the dramatist writes, if not with his entire eye, at least with one corner of it, on the box office; or the managers taboo any play which has too much mind for the good of the audience. Or it is a combination of the two. Mr. and Mrs. Babbit are the determining factor to author and manager and that is stark tragedy. The gigantic commercialization process which the whole world has undergone and is still undergoing has become the law in the theatre as it became the law of life. Plays deal with puny, innocuous ideas, about puny people in puny situations. The theatre has turned into an industry in which promotion ability, selling at any price and any cost is more important than the drama. Plays are purely incidental of the day's small things, with as little interest as a news item in the daily paper. They might really be called "journalistic" plays and bear about the same fate as a "news" story. They lack the thrill of exaltation that re-echoes through time. Strangely enough, it is the only art which has fallen to the modern god Industry. Painters, sculptors, and poets still retain an ideal that commences with art and not money.

Who can forget the passionate, exciting production of "Danton's Tod" which Reinhardt gave a few years ago! It had an idea of revolt as well as an ideal, and it was produced with a vigor and passion and tensity that carried the audience to the highest realm of emotion.

Aristophanes yelled himself hoarse against the Athenians; Shakespeare dissected the deepest and most fundamental human emotions in the most beautiful poetry that has ever been written; Ibsen screamed anathema against the smugness of Northern hardness; Hauptman, Tchekov, Shaw, all said courageously what they thought, never minding the box office returns. We have just as much material today as these men had. But instead, authors with ability need sweet tunes of musical comedies to popularize diluted satire. "Of Thee I Sing" is the most revolutionary play on Broadway today.

Mutual Enterprise of the Unemployed

By JACOB BAKER

IN THE winter of 1931-32 there developed in several parts of the United States organizations of unemployed who were determined to do something to help themselves. Some of them have been quite successful. Others have failed of their original objective. Some have started with a set purpose and developed along different lines. On the whole there can be no question but that the condition of unemployed people in communities where there is effective organization is much better than in communities without organization.

In point of accomplishment it is probable that the organization in Salt Lake City is outstanding. This is called the Natural Development Association. In the fall of 1931 Benjamin Stringham gave a number of lectures pointing out the advantages in people's making things for each other and exchanging them without the use of money and bank credit. By the middle of the winter he had a small group of people who were ready to try the plan. They received a donation of some potatoes, and their first exchange was with a barber for haircuts. The barber also stored the potatoes for them, and the members then brought in other members: tailors, shoemakers and so on who also gave services for potatoes.

In March a store was opened. In May credit coupons were printed so that the record of exchanges did not have to be kept in books. Immediately the business of the organization grew by leaps and bounds. In September the N. D. A. store did a $4000 business, all in coupons, on each of several days. They built a tannery at an expenditure of $175 in cash and $7000 in coupons. They have taken over a coal mine. They have 20,000 members, one-third of whom get most of the requirements of life under the N. D. A. system. The organization has branched out from Salt Lake to five other nearby cities. It has arranged exchanges of Utah coal or Oregon apples and is prepared to make other exchanges for eastern manufactured commodities. According to their reports about half the business firms of Salt Lake accept coupons in whole or part payment for goods. All kinds of professional services are available. It may be that the N. D. A. has about reached the point of saturation in Salt Lake City and Central Utah. It seems that its extension will have to be effected by spreading out through organizations in other communities.

In Los Angeles several thousand unemployed workers are producing things for themselves. No detailed report of their work has been published, so it is hard to say how nearly mutual this organization is.

In Seattle a mutualistic producing organization was set up in the summer of 1931. Considerable number of things were made by unemployed people for each other, but the development of this organization has gone ahead largely in political channels. The tendency has been to give more and more attention to the control of relief funds and their administration, so there is no assurance of a solid economic growth.

In Seattle the organization is called The Unemployed Citizens League and has given rise to a large number of similar groups bearing the same name in Portland, Takoma, and other western cities. At Day-

ton, Ohio, the social agencies have lent their assistance to group production of goods by unemployed people. According to reports this promises to be useful in lessening destitution.

Around New York not much has been done. In Paterson in the summer of 1932 two organizations were set up. One was intended as a producing cooperative and collected a good deal of food stuff from farmers, some wood and other commodities. The other organization devoted itself to protest activities and has not, so far as reported, been engaged in any production.

In times of depression jobs are scarce and money is scarce. Statistically and historically it appears that money gets scarce before jobs get scarce and that any method that will increase the flow of money can be expected to increase the number of jobs. This was the basis on which Proudhon formed the Bank of the People in Paris in 1848. The one thing that these mutual enterprises all do is to increase the number of exchanges made among people. The most successful one of this time is using a commodity money. It seems that this is fresh proof of the strength of Proudhon's opinion that the money problem is basic to the other economic problems. Any development of mutual exchanges, together with the issue of mutual money, can be expected to contribute to the solution of all our economic problems.

The present is an excellent time to develop such mutual organization and mutual money because the State is very hesitant in attacking any enterprise that lessens destitution at the present time.

On Freedom and Bolshevism

A Letter by T. H. Bell to Charles Erskine Scott Wood

My very dear venerable comrade:

Last night I was in your audience at the Liberal Forum and listened there with delight to your address on "What I Believe," with its wit, its poetry, its good humor and kindliness, its courage, its clear-sightedness, its plain-speaking and its excellent good sense.

I know that a man of eighty, no matter how vigorous he may appear to be, should not be bothered with letters after such an effort; but I was so moved by you last night that I cannot today resist the temptation to write. I do not do it in the way of criticism, of course; but to bring out in better relief a point or two in which I know—having read The Poet in the Desert—that we are really at one.

I want to remind you, then, that Capitalism is not the only evil, the only desperately dangerous one from which we are suffering at the present time. The Communist government of Russia, in that little war of a few months ago over the Manchurian railroad, did not invade Chinese territory out of capitalist greed. It is no doubt true that Japan's motives in the present trouble are largely economic; its dominating gang wants to exploit the wealth of Manchuria, to hold its twenty-five million Chinese as economic serfs. But not only the Japanese gang but the gang now dominating Russia wants these twenty-five million Chinese as conscript material, as cannon fodder, as stuff to be used to advantage in their dreams of glory and world power. The lust for greed in 1917 had a hard setback in Russia; the lust for power there is now as ruthless and as unscrupulous as it has ever been anywhere. Let me remind you that, though it seems so natural for us in America, where Capitalism alone dominates, to think of Capitalism as having caused the World War, yet, as a matter of fact, Capitalism in Russia then had nothing to say. What world markets were the Russian capitalists wanting? What had they to say when the general staff ordered mobilization? What could they have said? What, for that matter, could even the German capitalists have said when once the German general staff took charge?

No, Capitalism is not the only enemy. At the present moment, in fact, while it is weakened and crippled, suffering from a most alarming illness, its brother, the State, is growing more powerful, more arrogant, more dangerous every day. At any moment the world may again be plunged into the abyss of war; even the sons of the capitalists are thrown in with our own; no economic advantage to anybody is neccesary; any good slogan will do: "the safety of our country," "the defense of the working-class government," will serve to splash the earth with blood just as well as any of the older fakes.

The papers yesterday were full of the Communist boast about their million conscripts. You know well, I am sure, that no capitalist government would ever dare to send its working-class soldiers to Russia, to a Russia undefended by any army at all, if that capitalist government knew that there its soldiers would find a free and happy society better than their own.

You declared, speaking of Communism in Russia, that you were in favor of any experiment, any one at all. Surely, as a Libertarian, so am I. Free experiment in sociological matters, I am convinced, instead of so much confounded bossing of everybody's busines, when it is permitted, will give just as good results as were obtained when it began to be permitted in the other sciences. But on two conditions: First, that those who want the experiment conduct it at their own cost, they who believe in it; second, that it be conducted, as in all scientific experiments, open to examination and criticism. The Communist experiment in Russia is not being run by the Communists at their own cost but at the cost of the millions of their fellow-countrymen, angry peasants, dissatisfied workers, indignant revolutionists, starved, suppressed, shot, arrested in the night and packed off without trial to the most abominable hellholes, worse than those maintained by the Czar. And nobody in Russia dare breathe one single word of criticism or skepticism in regard to the experiment, much less expose its failures and the impudent lies used to support it. A soldier stands at the door of every printing shop. The spy and informer system is the greatest ever organized, beating even the Spanish Inquisition.

You remember how the great movements of Wyklif and the Lollards, of John Ball and his brave peasants, of the Albigenses and the Hussites, with their noble aspirations, their heroism and devotion, were finally turned into—the Protestant churches, more bigoted and tyrannical, if anything, than Rome itself.

All that about the States I know you know. I remember your own words: "The State! . . . Hater of Freedom. . . . Its wings are death; its eyes are graves. . . . Destroyer of the Soul . . . whore of force and prostitute of privilege. . . . "

I put you among our Anarchist poets, such as Burns, Shelley, Whitman, Wilde, Carpenter. But you were forgetting the point of Anarchism last night when you spoke of it as only an ideal in the distance. It is true that the old Anarchist-Communism of Kropotkin is dead, as a movement, long ago—as dead as the other one you mentioned, the Single Tax movement of George. But the Libertarian movement of today is not only fighting Capitalism and talking long-distance idealism; it is in today's struggle fighting fiercely against the desperate, pressing, immediate dangers of militarism and dictatorship, attacking the tendency of governmentalism to add constantly to its power and of the people to submit; it is leading the battle against governmental tyranny, not in one of its forms, but in all—nationalism, fascism, bolshevism, or any other form in which it attempts to shackle thought and enslave the free man.

When you urged so eloquently the claims of freedom in this America of ours and spoke so nobly of free speech, not only for what we approve but for what we loathe, you were with us in that struggle, and we feel you one of us.

Forgive me, dear old comrade, if I bother you or bore you. Last night when you were on the platform, as I sat in admiration, you stirred me deeply; you called to my mind very vividly my old comrades William Morris and Peter Kropotkin, and I put you with them in my heart, my elder brothers. You gave me fresh comfort, confidence and courage.

I am, yours in gratitude,

T. H. Bell

Los Angeles, Cal., May 3, 1932

Charles Erskine Scott Wood's Reply

I think I acknowledged your letter of May 3rd, but am never sure of my memory. I have no secretary and am forbidden use of my eyes because of cataract.

You will therefore understand this, my note of thanks for your kind expressions.

May 29, 1932 C. E. S. W.

Monopoly and Exclusiveness

Every monopoly, every sort of exclusion, is detestable. In the realm of ideas, monopolism is the greatest aberration that any mind can conceive of. It will always block any active, insurgent current of ideas, any initiative.

Anarchism will never be exclusive, for if it were, every tendency within the movement would be affected by bourgeois infiltration. Neither gods nor masters, nor yet any dogmas of churches belong in anarchism; but liberty, only liberty.

Thought is free, and its propagation must be free. Anarchism can have an initiative and esoteric diffusion. All dogmas call to heterodoxy. It is well that anarchists come to an understanding among themselves, form their groups and federations of groups. But neither one group nor an anarchist federation of groups will ever be all that Anarchism is. For anarchy has no limits, is always further, an intangible reality, a longing for perfection. To form a militant army, with orders of the day, with blowing of trumpets, may be alluring and enticing, but it is not anarchism. Many will dislike my pinpricks. But we must awaken the conscience and quicken the brain. Anarchists will never be a pack of sheep.

Anarchism will never be so flourishing and full of life as when each individual, each group, each federation does its utmost to develop the maximum of activity without ever waiting for the approval of others. Dynamism is not concentrated in an abstract center. In anarchism the center is a living reality, it is concrete and its name is the individual. Dynamics reside within each individual. Monopolies of ideas, monopolies of activities in propaganda, all are unnecessary. We must combat them as vain, pretentious and senseless anti-anarchist tendencies. Anarchy is freedom. Monopolists, never; Anarchists, always anarchists.

Translated from Germanal Esgleas, Barcelona

THE MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON
Founded October 9, 1909
will celebrate its Twenty-second Anniversary
with the
DAYBREAK COSTUME BALL
Friday Evening
December 9th
at
Webster Manor
11th Street and Fourth Avenue
For the Benefit of the School
THE MODERN SCHOOL OF STELTON
Old friends are expected, new ones are invited